UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,247	09/26/2003	Kohji Kanbara	243108US2	8580
22850 7590 06/02/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			CHAMPAGNE, DONALD	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3688	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/670,247	KANBARA, KOHJI	
Examiner	Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover st	neet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN COND	ITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filir application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amend application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply periods:	dment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final reject	on.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	e date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition ur have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the correspunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory periset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months afte may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	onding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee od for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4	1.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed on Abrief in compliance with 57 of K4 filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period seminorm.  AMENDMENTS	R 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of the consideration and/or segment that would require further consideration and/or segment to the consideration and consideration and/or segment to the consideration and considerati	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal be appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	y materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number	er of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Not	ice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	n a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entere how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appearance. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: .	
Claim(s) objected to Claim(s) rejected: <u>16-27 and 34-36</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the da because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons v was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, k entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejection showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier	s under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the	claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT p	lace the application in condition for allowance
because:  See the response to "3". There is an appropriate teaching in the reference n	ot considered by the augments
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper Note:	
<u> </u>	
	Champagne/ aminer, Art Unit 3688
•	

## **Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)**

**Application No.** 

Continuation of 3. NOTE: First, the new limitation (e.g., in claim 16) to "a single body" has limited support. Said "body" is disclosed in words as "one main body" only at para. [0004] of the published application (US 20040117258A1). There is no explicit tie disclosed to any of the figures.

Second, assume, arguendo, that the "image forming apparatus 201", disclosed, for example, in Fig. 15, is said "single body", then the claim limitation would be fully supported. However, that is not helpful because the "single body" limitation is taught by the reference (Kolls, US006615183B1) as "a system 500 or VENDING MACHINE" (col. 23 lines 9-12, emphasis added) with "display means 582 (col. 15 lines 1-3 and 20-23, and col. 7 lines 6-30 and 55-60 including Figs 3 and 3A).